

Appl. No.: 09/945,413  
Amtd. Dtd. Nov. 28, 2005  
Reply to Final Office Action dated Sept. 12, 2005

## **II. Remarks In Response to the Office Action**

### **A. General Remarks**

Claims 5 and 15 have been cancelled. Therefore, claims 1-4, 6-14, and 16-20 are pending in the application.

### **B. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102**

Claims 1-4, 6-14, and 16-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guess et al. (US 6,782,400) in view of Crozier (U.S. 5,701,423). Assignee respectfully traverses the conclusion that Guess in view of Crozier renders claims 1-20 obvious insofar as Guess in view of Crozier does not disclose all the limitations of independent claims 1, 9, 10, 11, 19, and 20, as amended.

Claims 1, 9, and 10 are respectively directed to a method, computer program, and system “for importing data from an origin to a destination by a user utilizing a network” and have been amended in essentially the same manner to include limitations from original claims 5 and 6. Claims 11, 19, and 20 are directed to a method, computer program, and system “for exporting data from an origin to a destination by a user utilizing a network” and have been amended in essentially the same manner to include limitations from original claims 15 and 16.

For example, independent claim 1, as amended, is directed to a “method for importing data from an origin to a destination.” Data to be imported, over a network, from the origin to the destination is identified. The destination is associated with a customer relationship application. A “set of predetermined rules associated with the customer relationship application” is identified. In addition, “*at least one user-specified function*” is associated “with the identified data.” “*The at least one user-specified function*” is “capable of transforming at least a portion of the identified data.”

The identified data is imported from the origin to the destination utilizing the network in accordance with the set of predetermined rules. In importing the identified data, “first fields for the data in the origin” are mapped “to second fields for the destination,” and “first field names of

Appl. No.: 09/945,413  
Amdt. Dtd. Nov. 28, 2005  
Reply to Final Office Action dated Sept. 12, 2005

the mapped first fields" are translated "to second field names of the second fields." In importing the identified data, *at least a portion of the identified data is transformed from the origin to the destination using the at least one user-specified functions.*

The imported data is made accessible to the customer relationship application. "[T]he mapping and translating are customizable by the user such that the second field names and the second fields in which the imported data is stored in the memory at the destination are customizable by the user."

In contrast, Guess is directed to "a system and method for transferring data between server systems." Guess at Abstract. Guess discloses a "configuration system 50" that "allows a user...to designate configuration details to locate the data to be transferred." Guess at col. 6:23-27. "Thus, the user could particularly identify the location of a specific data file." Guess at col. 6:34-35. Guess also discloses rules for processing the data. *See* Guess at col. 7:12 to col. 8:4. "Once the data has been processed, it can be formatted into the second file format...Formatting system 110 utilizes predefined formatting rules to format the data into a...report format... that is more conducive to review by the recipients." Guess at col. 8:10-24. The formatting system 110 "uses the formatting rules to arrange the data in a particular order, fashion, etc. For example, the formatting rules could dictate that data should be arranged into a particular sequence of columns/rows..., typeface convention..., etc." Guess at col. 8:35-42.

Guess fails to disclose that at least one user-specified function is associated with data identified to be imported or exported, where the at least one user-specified function is capable of transforming at least a portion of the identified data. In addition, Guess fails to disclose transforming data using such a user-specified function when importing or exporting data.  
Instead, Guess discloses that "data [of a flat file] could be re-formatted into a more suitable 'report-format'" (col. 7:10-11) by identifying "selective segments of the data to be forwarded to the recipient" (col. 7:43-44) and by "arrang[ing] the data in a particular order, fashion, etc." (col. 8:36-37).

Furthermore, the Final Office Action relies on the configuration system (60) of Figure 3 and col. 6:23-47 of Guess to support the contention that Guess discloses transforming the data

Appl. No.: 09/945,413  
Amdt. Dtd. Nov. 28, 2005  
Reply to Final Office Action dated Sept. 12, 2005

based on user-created scripting functions. Assignee respectfully disagrees. The configuration system (50) of Guess is used by a user to “designate precise configuration details to locate the data to be transferred...” so “the user could particularly identify the location of a specific data file” (emphasis added) Col. 6:23-35. In other words, the “configuration system 50 allows data in a first file format to be located.” Col. 6:48-49. The configuration system (50) of Guess is not a user-created scripting function capable of transforming data.

Guess makes no mention of user-specified functions in conjunction with the configuration system (50). Rather, it appears that the configuration system (50) allows the user to locate and select data of a flat file. Cozier is directed to translating dissimilarly-formatted data between disparate computer applications and platforms by allowing a user to map fields using displays. *See Abstract, FIGS. 5A-5B; and col. 9, line 35-61.*

Accordingly, Guess in view of Cozier fails to disclose transforming data from an origin to a destination using at least one user-specified function when importing or exporting the data. For at least these reasons, Applicants believe that claims 1-4, 6-14, and 16-20 are in proper form for allowance and respectfully request that the Examiner indicate the allowance of these claims in the next paper from the Office.

#### **D. Conclusion**

This Reply is being filed with a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) under 37 C.F.R. § 1.114. Accordingly, the undersigned representative authorizes the Commissioner to charge the amount of \$790.00 for the RCE fee, and any other amount that may be required, to Deposit Account No. 501922, referencing order no. 149-0119US.

Appl. No.: 09/945,413  
Amtd. Dtd. Nov. 28, 2005  
Reply to Final Office Action dated Sept. 12, 2005

To facilitate the resolution of any issues or questions presented by this paper, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner directly contact the undersigned by phone to further the discussion, reconsideration, and allowance of the claims.

Respectfully submitted,

Nov. 28, 2005

Date  
**Customer No. 29855**  
Wong, Cabello, Lutsch,  
Rutherford & Bruculeri, LLP  
20333 State Highway 249, Suite 600  
Houston, Texas 77070  
Direct: 832/446-2416  
Fax: 832/446-2424

  
Sean McDermott – Reg. No. 49,000

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.8	
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office Facsimile No. <b>571-273-8300</b> on Date: <u>NOV. 28, 2005</u> .	
 Signature <u>Rebecca Ginn</u>	